



# european parliament

information series

LIBRARY

the sittings

2

february 1977



## **THE SITTINGS**

**LUXEMBOURG 7th – 11th FEBRUARY 1977**

Fishing and the Commission's Tenth General Report were the main talking points in Luxembourg this week, with the stir over the United Kingdom's legislation schedule coming a close third. On fishing, Commissioner Finn Olav Gundelach spoke of a breakthrough at the Council meeting in Brussels on February 9th. He was optimistic of a successful outcome both to negotiations with third countries (despite a question mark over Iceland) and to discussions on what is coming to be known as the Community's internal fishing policy. On the tenth general report, Roy Jenkins's first major policy statement to the European Parliament, one can only say reactions varied.

On the UK's legislation schedule, Council President John Tomlinson told Parliament that the British Government intends 'to use its best endeavours' to get its direct elections bill through on time. What he did not say was when this bill will be published, an omission that was hardly reassuring.

## **THE FOCAL POINTS**

### **Common fisheries policy : a breakthrough?**

The interesting thing about Parliament's session in Luxembourg this week is that it seems to have marked or to have coincided with a barely perceptible turning point in the Community's progress towards a common fisheries policy.

It is true that the proposals under discussion – broadly approved by the European Parliament – are not substantially any different from those outlined somewhat vaguely to the House in Strasbourg in January 1975 : the policy

amounts to a 200 mile zone with limited access for third countries and carefully calculated fish catch quotas within this zone for Community nationals.

What is new, perhaps, is the emphasis on conservation. Late in the night on Tuesday – or rather at about 5 o'clock in the morning of Wednesday – the Council seemed agreed that herring fishing must be banned or curbed at once, though how this will affect kipper production is not yet clear. And the same will apply to Norwegian pout.

At the same time Ireland, for example, will receive special consideration over quotas : these will be set above historic levels to give the Irish the opportunity to develop their industry and quotas for other EC vessels will be below – down to, say, 80 per cent – the historic catches. Meanwhile the 12 mile exclusive coastal zones – a temporary waiver – will continue to stand.

And 400 m u.a. will be earmarked for the modernization and what is called the 'restructuring' of the fishing industry.

All this may not sound very much. But it was enough to prompt the cautious Commissioner Finn Gundelach – who must have had one of the hardest day's nights in Community history on Tuesday and Wednesday – to talk about a breakthrough. 75 per cent of the Commission's proposals had been accepted, he said and agreement was possible on even more.

It is true, he said, that the threat of unilateral action by some Member States (Britain and Ireland) is still making for a tense atmosphere. But, one gathers, he does seem to have got it accepted that the Nine here must act as one.

And this is nowhere more to the point than in the Community's relations – over fishing – with third countries. And here the progress has been very impressive. Even the Russians seem to be regarding the Community – somewhat deviously, it is true – as a party to negotiations.

The arrangements with Norway and the Faroe Islands – a gentleman's agreement to keep to 1976 catch levels in each other's waters for the time being – are fairly typical. As for Sweden, which has just claimed half the Baltic as its fishing grounds, Finn Gundelach commented laconically that she has more to lose in the North Sea than the Nine have to gain in the Baltic.

Negotiations with the United States and Canada are proceeding in a highly satisfactory way, Mr Gundelach told the House (and Council President John

Tomlinson confirmed this) and there is progress in negotiations with a number of other countries.

The only minus point, he said, is Iceland. He was, he said, coming to the end of what he had to say — for all his sympathy with the Icelanders. He thought the Community was entitled to an answer and he expected to get one.

All in all though, Mr Gundelach seemed to feel that the Brussels policy agreement of February 9th — it still has to firm out into a formal agreement — was the equivalent, as far as the internal regime is concerned, to the October 30th agreement reached at The Hague concerning the regime for third countries.

Mr Gundelach looked very tired when the House rose at after 8 p.m. on Wednesday. He had been present in the debate for over five hours — after only one hour's sleep the night before. And there was still some scepticism as to what had been achieved.

But perhaps the most significant indicator of progress is that no one, now, is talking seriously about 50 mile exclusive zones any more. There is talk of licensing, limiting mesh size, placing limits on the length of boats and even the size of engines and even too of conservation areas.

But Parliament's motion, tabled by Niels Anker Kofoed (Da,L) and agreed to by a pretty substantial majority, made no reference to exclusives. And the amendments to the motion that did refer to 50 mile zones received no substantial support. And certainly the tone of Parliament's debate was far less tense than those earlier debates on fishing : arguments over vital questions of detail rather than crucial questions of policy.

So Mr Gundelach may be right. The Community may now indeed be approaching agreement on how to divide up a dwindling resource. If it is, it will be something of a triumph for the Community idea, to which Mr Gundelach made frequent reference. And if it is, it is to be hoped, too that at least some of the credit will go to Finn Gundelach for his part in achieving it.

## Jenkins State-of-Community message

“We want our deeds to be a little better than our words”. President Roy Jenkins presents the Commission’s Tenth General Report and outlines his programme for 1977.

*Agriculture:* Mr Jenkins promised a review of the CAP’s long-term objectives, to serve ‘not merely to keep the Common Agricultural Policy afloat, but to chart its course in the right direction.’ The farm price proposals would be framed with an eye to ‘the overriding need to combat inflation.’

*Economic integration:* Unemployment, inflation and the widening gap between Member States economic performance and standards of living would provide ‘the central theme of our economic policies in the period ahead.’ Mr Jenkins rejected the view that the Community could no longer hope to close the gap between richest and poorest Community areas.

*Industrial policy:* No harmonization for harmonization’s sake, Mr Jenkins promised.

*Energy policy:* ‘The short-term economic case for a big immediate investment in nuclear power stations must be weighed against possible environmental dangers.’

*Unemployment:* Mr Jenkins said stimulating demand was not enough. What the Commission would aim for was coordinated labour market policies throughout the EC.

*Europe of the citizen:* Here the major event was direct elections to the European Parliament. To this end the Commission would do its utmost to ensure that each voter was fully informed of what the Community was and how it affected his day-to-day life.

*Enlargement:* The fact that so many countries had lodged, or were thinking of lodging applications for EC memberships, showed how attractive the Community was. ‘The Commission will be sympathetic to enlargement but it will insist that the problems be faced and not glossed over,’ Mr Jenkins said.

In conclusion, Mr Jenkins promised caution. ‘We must not promise what we cannot achieve ... but at the same time we must not limit our real possibilities of achievement by a deadening caution or an inability to lift our sights. We want our deeds to be a little better than our words.’

These concluding words were remembered by several speakers during Parliament's six-hour debate on Mr Jenkins's address which occupied most of Thursday's agenda, and remembered with approval.

But, in general, reactions were neither overly laudatory nor overly critical. The President's statement had failed, in the words of British Liberal Russell Johnston, 'either to anger or delight. It said everything, or almost everything, and nothing, or almost nothing.'

Socialist Group leader Ludwig Fellermaier welcomed Jenkins's speech of Tuesday as being above all realistic: Jenkins had not attempted to reach for the stars and was thus unlikely to fall flat on his face. His pragmatic step by step approach was a refreshing contrast to the often grandiose aspirations the House had listened to in the past.

But Mr Fellermaier began by referring to the Commission's 10th Annual Report. He hoped that in future it would contain more comparative data so that those reading it could more easily assess what the Commission had actually achieved during the year concerned. Turning then to the Commission's programme for 1977, the speaker said he recognized that it had inevitably to be a compromise. The programme was less important than what the Commission actually succeeded in achieving. And that achievement would be looked at particularly critically during the months preceeding direct elections to the EP, when the voter would be paying special attention to what was going on in Brussels.

Mr Fellermaier also welcomed President Jenkins's emphasis on information policy. But to succeed, it was vital that the Community stopped portraying itself in Euro-jargon and started speaking in a language that the man in the street could understand. The European TV networks had had a great deal of success with their programme 'It's a knock out' — perhaps Eurovision might concentrate rather more on informing than entertaining Europe's citizens.

The three central points of the Commission's programme concerned the economic situation, unemployment and the gap between rich and poor. For the Socialists, the question of unemployment was particularly vital and would constitute a central theme in the campaign for European elections. The Tripartite Conference would have a major role to play in this respect. Another vital issue was the Community's relations with the developing countries, who expected to be able to share in the world's wealth.

Turning to agriculture Mr Fellermaier pointed out that Mr Jenkins apparently recognized the problems of the CAP, and he hoped the Commission would come forward with constructive proposals for their solution. On the subject of enlargement, the speaker said we had to weigh the advantages of an expanded Community against the need for an economically healthy EC, which alone could play a constructive role in the world.

If the Socialist spokesman had been conciliatory, indeed praising, of Mr Jenkins's address, Christian Democrat Group leader Alfred Bertrand (Be) was critical. Mr Jenkins had, he said, attempted to hide the fact that the Commission has as yet been unable to agree on policies or actions. But in fact all he had done was to list problems facing the Community without offering solutions. This applied in particular to the CAP, where the problems had been identified but proposals were entirely lacking. It was not Parliament's job, but the Commission's, to take the initiative and suggest solutions.

As regards economic integration, Mr Bertrand wanted to know how the Commission intended to get the Member States to adopt the necessary policies. And why had Mr Jenkins made no reference to last week's meeting between French President Giscard d'Estaing and German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, who had stated publicly that both sides intended to devote special efforts towards making economic and monetary union a reality.

Mr Jenkins had pointed out, said the speaker, that the Commission was not a government. But this philosophy scarcely did justice to the role assigned to the Commission under the Treaties: if the Council disposed, it was only on proposals from the Commission, and Mr Jenkins should not underestimate the political significance of this right of initiative. Mr Bertrand hoped he would make full use of it.

Mr Bertrand did support President Jenkins's cautious attitude towards enlargement. If the EC could not function as a Community of Nine, how was it ever going to function if it had thirteen Members? Certainly, majority voting in the Council was essential. And he asked Mr Jenkins : 'Which countries do you believe should belong to the Community of the future? '

Other points that the President had missed, said Mr Bertrand, were the Community's own resources, political cooperation and, above all, the transport sector. But the speaker concluded by endorsing Mr Jenkins's assertion that, for the Commission, deeds were more important than words.



For the Liberals, Cornelis Berkhouwer (Du) referred to various issues to which, he thought, the Commission should be giving priority. One of these was protectionism, which remained one of the greatest evils facing the Community and, indeed, the world in general. The days of 'Buy British' or 'Made in Germany' were now finally over. Nevertheless, Mr Berkhouwer could not help noting that there was still far too much encouragement within individual Member States to just such chauvinist thinking – he referred to Mr Callaghan's recent call to British shipping lines to buy from British yards. And in a sense, he maintained, the unemployment issue was being overplayed: If there were 5.4 million jobless in the Community, there were also around 10 million migrant workers and their families.

Referring to contacts with Comecon countries, Mr Berkhouwer said that trade was one thing, but it should not be confused with the freedom of the individual.

It was all very well to be cautious about enlarging the Community, the speaker went on, but it was not up to us to choose whom we wanted and whom we did not: the Treaty laid down what conditions applicants had to fulfil if they wanted to join, and once these conditions were fulfilled we had no right to say no. In the case of Greece, indeed, we had already, with the Association Agreement, entered into a firm commitment to let Greece join. We could not now have second thoughts because this country or that might be an economic burden on the Community – we could not afford to become a rich man's club.

Finally, Mr Berkhouwer turned to a theme lying dear to his heart: immigration controls at Community frontiers. To laughter, he said that on the way from Belgium to Luxembourg he had been asked whether he had anything to declare – and all he had been driving was a little Volkswagen. As to British immigration controls, well, they were a disaster. What we needed now was a European passport so that the average European citizen could see that he lived in a Community of states. He hoped Mr Jenkins would give this matter priority.

Brian Lenihan (Ir), EPD spokesman, began by stressing how important it is to tell people about the Community. If there is a low poll at the first European elections due to public apathy, it could impair the legitimacy of the first elected European Parliament. And, he warned, what people did know of the Community was not such as to enamour them of the European Institutions, as Eurobarometer polls showed. Mr Lenihan thought the reason for this lay in the inability of the decision-taking Euro-Council to take decisions. This was the biggest single factor eroding public confidence.

He suggested streamlining procedure and making sure top-level meetings are properly prepared. Until this key problem was solved, indeed, it was hard to envisage the enlargement of the Community even though this was something he would welcome. A failure in decision-taking apart, the big problem was the way the Nine's economies went their own ways.

He pointed to the unemployment figure : five and a half million, 35 per cent of whom were under 25. He welcomed Mr Jenkins's remarks on getting Europe back to work but, again, was disturbed by the sheer paucity of the Community's resources. The regional and social funds are minimal compared with the corresponding heads of national expenditure.

Mr Lenihan suggested reflation would help. It was a course that Germany, Japan and the USA should take. Meanwhile, in the EC, a lot could be done by coordinating the use of resources. And here he included the EAGGF.

Mr Lenihan incidentally deplored the polarization of opinion into consumer and producer lobbies. This was class politics and had no place in the Community. He reminded the House that there was a large consumer element in the CAP in the form of the 1.5 million pound subsidy to consumers in the United Kingdom.

Another part of the answer to economic divergence was the transfer of resources, but here the transferee state had to accept conditions; monetary discipline was essential.

In conclusion Mr Lenihan said that if the Community were to have a human face and appeal to the younger generation — the vein of gold — Europe's whole educational system needed to be tailored to job prospects in a properly coordinated way.

Sir Peter Kirk (Br), EC spokesman, suggested that Mr Jenkins would be justified in feeling aggrieved in that many members had taken him to task for not speaking long enough and many of the comments had been on what Mr Jenkins had not said. He personally was not looking for a seven hour speech in the manner of the Communist dictatorships but he was a little surprised that Mr Jenkins's whole tenor had been economic and not at all political. This was something of a contrast with the emphasis on the political of Mr Jenkins's speech of January 11th.

Among points he would have liked Mr Jenkins to touch on were the Tindeman's report — could anything be saved from this, he asked? He also wanted to know what Mr Jenkins thought about the whole working of the Council. For it was clear that the fault in the Community lay there rather than with the Parliament or the Commission and the creation of the Euro-Council had brought the Community to a standstill.

He agreed with Mr Lenihan that the meetings of this Council were not properly prepared. How could busy men achieve anything in one and a half days? He also wanted to know what the Commission had to say about its role in political cooperation, one of the areas in which the Community had been so successful. His group would like to see the Conference of Foreign Ministers have a proper secretariat within the Commission.

Turning to the points mentioned by Mr Jenkins he wanted to know what he meant by an 'overall' approach to enlargement. And had the Commission any estimate of the scale of the Regional, Social and Agricultural funds that would be needed when Greece, Spain and Portugal joined?

Sir Peter also wanted to know whether the USSR was now negotiating with the United Kingdom in its capacity as President of the Council.

Turning to agriculture Sir Peter said he was not sure he agreed with Mr Lenihan. He thought the problem was a structural one and he referred to the Mansholt plan which had argued along these lines nine years ago and was still gathering dust on the shelves. He drew the attention of the House to an article by Professor March in the 'New Federalist' calling for a two-tier agricultural policy.

Lastly, on direct elections, Sir Peter expressed surprise that the Commission had intimated it would not be involved. 'We are going to need them at every level', he said: 'the Commission must join in'.

Mr Renato Sandri (It) began by excusing the absence of some of his colleagues on the Communist benches. This was not due to a lack of interest but to the fact that they were in Italy despatching legislation covering direct elections. This would make Italy the first to ratify the Convention of September 20th. Mr Sandri's remarks were applauded on all sides of the House.

Mr Sandri welcomed Mr Jenkins's approach and his outlines of the Community's problems but he found him somewhat preoccupied with day to day affairs and

with the whole idea of progressing towards economic and monetary union. He did not feel that this preoccupation would serve the Community well at a time of regional decline. Referring to his own country he said that his group advocated a policy of equitable austerity at home and equal responsibility abroad.

He shared Mr Jenkins's desire to cooperate with the US adding only that he thought the relationship should be one of equality.

Lastly with reference to enlargement he reminded the House that the opposition parties in Greece, Spain and Portugal saw accession to the Community as a weapon against fascism.

Mr Erwin Lange (Ge, S) thought the main question facing the Community is whether the Member States are prepared to act together. Economically too the question was whether the other industrial countries could be persuaded to align their policies on those of the Community. One great drawback as far as economic policy was concerned was the total lack of any energy policy. And he again stressed the importance of not being vulnerable to undue pressure from the oil producing countries.

Mr Ernst Müller-Hermann (Ge, CD) shared Mr Lenihan's concern about the Community's lack of a common economic policy. He asked Mr Jenkins what the Commission's view of economic integration in the future was. How was solidarity to be articulated and how was the Community to cope with the implications of a world division of labour which rightly meant giving the developing countries a chance but which would also bring enormous structural and regional problems with it.

In Russell Johnston's (Br, L) view, Mr Jenkins's address had 'said everything, or nearly everything, and nothing, or nearly nothing.' The only controversy was in what it had omitted.

But President Jenkins did not seem to realize the strength of his own position: after direct elections the European Parliament would inevitably become far less supra-national in its approach as Members found themselves increasingly with local and constituency interests to represent. Parliament would tend to become like the Council and the Commission would then stand alone in being able to offer objective Community solutions to European problems.

Chairman of the Regional and Transport Committee John Evans (Br, S) stressed the need for the new Commission to develop a genuine regional policy to supplement the Regional Fund. He also questioned the wisdom of clinging to the principle, enshrined in the Treaty, of free movement of capital: capital, by moving to where 'the grass was greenest and the returns highest, inevitably ended up in the most prosperous regions and thus exacerbated existing disparities.

Speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs, Hans-Edgar Jahn (Ge, CD) welcomed the Commission's plans for these sectors, and then added a number of specific areas which, in his committee's view, needed particular attention.

Cornelis Laban (Du, S) expressed his Group's disappointment at Mr Jenkins's remarks on the CAP, which he described as 'a time-bomb which will explode unless something is done soon.' He also hoped for more details from the Commission about the 'moderate' farm price increases mentioned by Mr Jenkins. Isidor Fröh (Ge, S) also referred to the need for a thorough-going review of the situation in the agricultural sector.

Paul de Clercq (Be, L) said he had found Mr Jenkins's speech very interesting but was concerned about the 'overall' approach to enlargement the Commission seemed to favour. He suggested this might be appropriate to future applicants but hardly for Greece. He was concerned too that Mr Jenkins had said so little about the Community's own resources. Because Parliament's powers were very much at issue. It was not enough to spell out principles. Detailed implementation had to follow.

James Spicer's (Br, EC) concern was also enlargement. One of the questions people would be asking of candidates for direct election to the Parliament would be: 'How is enlargement going to affect the Community?' This needed to be costed out. After all the Community had still not really come clear through the experience of its first enlargement.

Manfred Schmidt (Ge, S) disagreed. He trusted that there would be no back-peddalling on enlargement. It was a Treaty commitment. He asked Mr Jenkins too to say something about this and about trade with the USA — he found the current deficit unacceptable. He thought the Commission viewed both these matters a little too positively.

Georges Clerfaÿt (Be, Ind) was very critical of Mr Jenkins. He quoted him as saying in January that he would not betray his national origins. He need have no

fear that he had done that. The British trade mark of fog was stamped all over his speech. He shared the concern expressed by Mr Bertrand and Mr De Clercq that the Commission made no reference to 'own resources' and he was disturbed about the staff policy now being pursued at the Commission. Was Mr Jenkins living up to his promises? What disappointed him most was the lack of any ideal, like European Union, for the people of the Nine to look forward to. They needed less fog and more vision.

Hans-Jürgen Klinker (Ge, CD) discussed agricultural policy problems and Ferruccio Pisoni (It, CD) the plight of Europe's under-privileged.

André Guerlin (Fr, S) spoke of the need for a Commissioner and Directorate-General responsible for consumer affairs, and Lord Walston (Br, S), making his final speech to the House before retiring, referred to the annual farm price review as 'an annual ritual dance' without much significance: Luxembourg dairy farmers, for example, received no more for their milk now than two years ago – the two intervening price increases had been swallowed up by the dairies.

For Richard Mitchell (Br, S) the key issue was direct elections. 200 years ago the American colonists were saying 'no taxation without representation' – and the outcome had been the United States. Was there a parallel to be drawn with Europe of 1978?

Luigi Noé (It, CD) underlined the urgency of proceeding with a Community nuclear energy programme. There was no alternative in sight, and without adequate energy there could be no economic growth and no full employment.

Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD) insisted on the need for full Community financial autonomy, and his colleague Pierre Deschamps (Be, CD) spoke of the Community's responsibilities to the developing countries. Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (Br, EC) lamented past failure to make progress towards economic and monetary union.

Final speaker in the debate was German Liberal Martin Bangemann, who said he could not share James Spicer's pessimistic view of enlargement: we, as a Community, had an obligation towards those countries which were now back on the path of democracy.

Replying to the debate, Mr Jenkins said he had been encouraged, disturbed, but never bored with what speakers had had to say. Parliament and the Commission

were natural partners, but that did not mean they should not be totally frank with one another.

He had been accused, he said, of raising issues without providing answers. But how could the Commission, after four weeks in office, be expected to have all the solutions? He had simply wanted to show that the Commission was aware and thinking about the problems that existed.

Nor could he accept Mr Clerfayt's view that he was a pragmatist. He had declared his fundamental belief in European union in the speech he had made to the House in January — Members could not expect him to repeat himself with every new speech to the House.

Where speakers had been right in pointing to an omission was in his failure to refer to own resources, Mr Jenkins admitted. He certainly regarded that as an issue of the first importance.

But on the question of enlargement he remained cautious. The question of Greek entry had already been accepted and negotiations were proceeding. But we could not simply overlook the economic difficulties that would be posed by other applicants: we had to be in a position, once a new member joined, to help them economically as well as politically.

Mr Jenkins said he saw the Community's regional policy as the geographical dimension of its economic policy, and he agreed that more coordination between EC Funds was essential. And in conclusion, the President promised that the Commission would indeed make full use of its power of initiative — but he was convinced that proposals, when they were made, needed to be well-prepared and not simply the result of compromise.

### **Minimum price for imported energy**

'More to solving Europe's energy problems than wearing long underpants' says Guido Brunner

The European Parliament has frequently deplored the Council's inaction over energy policy. It did so again this week à propos of reports submitted by Pierre Giraud (Fr, S) and Ove Guldberg (Da, L). Mr Giraud was asking the House to endorse Commission proposals for a 'minimum safeguard price for imported

energy' and, with reservations by some speakers, the House went along with it. The sense of these proposals is that they will afford a measure of protection to those developing alternative energy sources, although as Mr Giraud pointed out, their chances of being accepted by the Council are not good. They have, after all, been on the Council table for two years already. And there is still no decision. Of course the minimum price was no panacea but as oil prices will decide all energy prices for the next ten years, those seeking to promote other sources must be given some guarantee (customs duties, levies, quotas, consumer taxes) against the oil price collapsing. The actual level agreed, of course, would be a political compromise. The seven dollar per barrel figure being put forward was already a bit out of touch with reality. And this compromise itself would have to be part of a package: transparency about refining capacity and marketing would have to be included too.

Replying to the debate, Commissioner Guido Brunner told the House that Europe's dependency on oil was today greater than ever, despite all the brave words that had been uttered after the oil crisis of 1973/74. The latest oil price rise would cost the EC an extra \$3,200m per year – as against only \$2,700m for the United States and \$1,700m for Japan. And North Sea oil – three million barrels of it per day in the eighties – would make only a 10 per cent dent in total Community consumption.

The EC had to realise that each Member State was in the same boat. Energy use has continued to rise despite the recession. We did not want a return to the 1974 situation in which the multinationals were supplying Holland with oil because the Community wouldn't.

What to do? Firstly, we had to develop our indigenous sources of energy. That meant coal and nuclear energy. By 1985 we could expect that 3 per cent of our needs would be met by solar power, and 1 per cent from geothermal sources. And it now looked as if only 9 per cent of energy rather than the envisaged 13 per cent, would be nuclear in origin.

Secondly, we had to concentrate more on saving energy – and wearing long underpants would not be enough. Areas which should be given special attention included insulation of buildings and utilization of waste heat from power stations.

The debate, he concluded, has shown how hard it was to reach agreement on a policy for energy. And the prospects were pretty gloomy.



**Abbreviations:** Br British, Ir Irish, Be Belgian, Da Danish, Du Dutch, Fr French, Ge German, It Italian, Lu Luxembourg, S Socialist, CD Christian Democrat, L Liberal and Democrat, EC European Conservative, EPD European Progressive Democrat, CA Communist and Allies, EC European Community.

## **THE WEEK IN LUXEMBOURG**

Monday, February 7th to Friday, February 11th 1977  
(Document numbers in brackets)

### **Monday, 7th February**

- Parliament welcomes new Belgian, German and Irish Members. Hans-Joachim Hoffman, 32, becomes youngest member.
- Rudi Adams elected Vice-President in succession to Walter Behrendt.
- Petitions calling for a European code to cover road accident victims and another concerning Europe and the younger generation received and noted.
- EPDs put down motion on Middle-East.
- Richard Burke promises new deal for consumers but asks for time to produce results. (doc. 541/76)
- Barging through Europe: doubts about costs of Commission proposals for improving the lot of Community boatmen. Socialists press for twelve-hour rest periods to be written into new regulations. (doc. 484/76)
- Biennial reports on competition in transport to be discontinued. (doc. 537/76)

### **Tuesday, 8th February**

- EPD on the Middle-East referred to Political Committee.
- Question Time: 14 questions put to the Commission. (doc. 551/76)

- Energy: minimum safeguard price for imported energy agreed to. House deplores Council's failure to agree a common energy policy. (doc. 530/76, 431/76)
- Roy Jenkins presents the Commission's Tenth General Report and announces his programme for 1977. (doc. 555/76)
- Parliament requests Commission to submit plans for telling Europe about direct elections by March 31st. (doc. 526/76)
- Parliament approves Commission proposal concerning unit trusts. (doc. 532/76)

### **Wednesday, 9th February**

- Question Time: John Tomlinson answers 8 questions put to the Council and 3 addressed to him in his capacity as President of the Conference of Foreign Ministers. (doc. 551/76)
- North-South Dialogue may resume at the end of April or the beginning of May says John Tomlinson in reply to Pierre-Bernard Cousté's question. (doc. 540/76)
- Hope of compromise soon on implementing red lead directive says John Tomlinson in reply to Italian Communist Members. (doc. 542/76)
- Common fisheries policy: a breakthrough? Finn Gundelach says he thinks so. Parliament broadly approves Commission proposals on management and conservation of fishery resources. (doc. 543/76, 474/76)
- Parliament approves Commission proposals for minimum price for imported sardines. (doc. 529/76)

### **Thursday, 10th February**

- The state of the Community: Parliament takes stock in debate on the Commission's Tenth General Report. (doc. 555/76)
- House agrees to a motion embodying adoption of the following draft joint declaration:  
The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission stress the prime

importance they attach to the protection of fundamental rights, as derived in particular from the constitutions of the Member States and the European Convention on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the exercise of their powers and in pursuance of the aims of the European Communities they respect and will continue to respect these rights. (doc. 557/76)

- House agrees to motion calling for sanctions against anyone contravening Community law. (doc. 531/76)
- Parliament debates John Prescott's interim report on the Community shipping industry (doc. 479/76). Commissioner Etienne Davignon tells the House of a secret meeting he had with the Japanese on 5th February. He had been told that the Japanese would cut back their 300,000 labour force in the shipping industry by 50,000 and check export prices to see there was no dumping.
- Commission joins Parliament in condemning repeated violations of human rights in Uruguay. (doc. 544/76)

### **Friday, 11th February**

- Parliament approves Commission proposals to reduce percentages of Italy's Benevento tobacco crops taken into intervention in 1977, 1978 and 1979 but disagrees as to actual proportion. Commission and Parliament compromise on details. (doc. 549/76)
- Parliament approves Commission proposal designed to show effects of monetary fluctuations as separate budgetary item – not attributable to the cost of the CAP. (doc. 538/76)
- Parliament and Commission differ in approach to recovery of claims under EAGGF. (doc. 527/76)
- Parliament approves recommendations of EC-Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee. (doc. 548/76)
- Parliament approves Commission proposals for improving production and marketing of citrus fruits. Asks that bergamots be included. (doc. 545/76/rev.)

## **THE SITTINGS**

The Sittings is available free of charge on request.

A complete record of the proceedings of the House is given in the the 'Debates of the European Parliament' which is published as an Annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities.

The 'Debates' and other documents may be obtained either from the Secretariat of the European Parliament (P.O. Box 1601, Luxembourg) or from the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (P.O. Box 1003, Luxembourg).

### **The Debates**

Annual subscriptions:	6.25 pounds
-----------------------	-------------

Single copies:	
up to 32 pages	0.21 pounds
up to 80 pages	0.42 pounds

### **Information Offices**

The Information Offices of the European Parliament in Dublin and London distribute regular press releases on parliamentary business, and deal with specific requests for information. Lectures to various groups, organisations and schools about the structure and functions of the European Parliament are available on request.

Dublin Office: 29 Merrion Square, Dublin 2

London Office: 20 Kensington Palace Gardens, London W 8 4QQ

If you find 'The Sittings' interesting and would like to receive it regularly, will you please fill in the form below. 'The Sittings' will then be sent to you each month free of charge.

**Directorate-General  
for Information and Public Relations  
  
European Parliament, P.O. Box 1601  
Luxembourg**

Please send The Sittings to (\*):

Name: .....

Christian Name: .....

Street ..... No. ....

Postal Code: ..... Town: .....

Country: .....

007702

(\*) Please use block letters

